

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

RUBEN QUIROZ-TREJO,

*Petitioner,*

v.

DAVID RIVERA,

*Respondent.*

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

CASE No.: 3:15-cv-1020

SENIOR JUDGE WILLIAM J. HAYNES, JR.

*ORDER*

*This motion*

*IS GRANTED for*

*the time requested*

*WJH*  
*12-28-15*

---

**PETITIONER'S SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPLY/TRVERSE**

---

Pursuant to M.D. TENN. L.R. 7.01(b) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2243 and 2248, Petitioner respectfully requests a second ten extension of time to file the Reply/Traverse to the Return filed by Respondent. (ECF No. 9). This Court previously permitted leave to submit a Reply/Traverse on or before December 18, 2015. (ECF No. 11) On December 18, 2015, Petitioner, through counsel, submitted a request for ten additional days to submit the Reply/Traverse, which was necessitated by counsel's unexpected absence due to illness. (ECF No. 12) This Court granted Petitioner's Motion on December 21, 2015. (ECF No. 13) Petitioner now requests a second extension of seven (7) days to file his Reply/Traverse, until and including **January 4, 2015**.

As good cause for this Motion, Petitioner, through counsel, states that additional time is needed to analyze the recent 107-page *en banc* decision of the First Circuit in *Castañeda v. Souza*, Nos. 13-1994, 13-2509, U.S. App. Lexis 22565, which that court issued on December 23, 2015. Because *Castañeda* adds extensive analysis that departs significantly from the prior Circuit precedents offered by the government, Petitioner's counsel seeks a brief extension of time to fully digest the opinion.